

University of Groningen

Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri

Kortekaas, Georgius Arnoldus Antonius

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1984

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kortekaas, G. A. A. (1984). *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

I Introduction

1 *The Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri: contents, nature, and distribution.*

It hath been sung at festivals,
On ember-eves and holy-ales;
And lords and ladies in their lives
Have read it for restoratives.

Shakespeare, *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*,
Act I, sc. 1, 5–8 (see n. 1)

The story

The *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (hereafter abbreviated to HA) is an ancient tale of unknown origin that has come down to us in Latin and enjoyed great popularity in the Middle Ages². Briefly summarized, its story runs as follows³:

(chs. 1–3) Once upon a time, Antioch is ruled by the cruel King Antiochus, who is living in incest with his own daughter. He does not want to marry her off, and successfully manages to eliminate suitors by propounding an unsolvable riddle to them and putting them to death when they cannot find the solution.

(chs. 4–7) But Apollonius, the young King of Tyre, is not to be deterred from proposing marriage, and thanks to his erudition he finds the solution to the riddle. Yet he is told that his solution is wrong, but that he will be granted another chance in thirty days' time. Apollonius returns to his home town. Antiochus sends an assassin after him. Having reached Tyre before the assassin, Apollonius consults his books, which confirm the correctness of his solution to the riddle; he understands that he is in danger of his life and decides to flee in the guise of a merchant with a ship full of corn. Arriving too late, the assassin notifies Antiochus that Apollonius is nowhere to be found, and Antiochus sets a high price on Apollonius' head.

(chs. 8–10) Apollonius lands in famine-stricken Tarsus, where he sells his corn at cost price. In gratitude, the citizens then erect a statue to the hunted young man.

(chs. 11–23) In order to baffle pursuit, Apollonius puts out to sea again. He is shipwrecked in a tempest and washed up on the coast of Cyrene. A poor fisherman gives him half of his shabby garment and shows him the way to the town, where King Archistrates holds court. The King's daughter falls in love with Apollonius and soon the wedding is celebrated.

(chs. 24–28) Then the news reaches them that the wicked Antiochus and his daughter have been struck by lightning and that the throne of Antioch is now awaiting Apollonius. Apollonius embarks together with his pregnant wife. Once at sea, fate strikes again: a tempest bursts on the ship, which causes Apollonius' wife to give premature birth to a daughter, Tharsia, upon which she falls into a

state of suspended animation. At the crew's insistence, Apollonius decides to commit the body of his wife, who is supposed to be dead, to the waves. The coffin washes ashore near Ephesus and is found by a physician, who wants to cremate the body. But just in time a clever pupil of the physician's discovers that the woman is only apparently dead, and in an ingenious way he manages to resuscitate her. When she turns out to be of royal blood, the physician places her in the famous temple of Artemis at Ephesus. Meanwhile Apollonius has travelled to Tarsus, has entrusted his daughter to foster-parents there, and has retired to Egypt to mourn his wife.

(chs. 29–36) The years pass by. Tharsia grows up and greatly surpasses her foster-sister in beauty. Believing Apollonius to be dead, her foster-parents decide to make away with Tharsia. Their steward is ordered to kill the girl, but just as he is getting ready to do so, pirates appear, who carry Tharsia off to Mytilene as a prize. The town's most prominent citizen, Athenagoras, and a brothel-keeper bid against each other, but the brothel-keeper wins. Though placed in a brothel, Tharsia yet manages to preserve her virginity.

(chs. 37–44) After mourning for fourteen years, Apollonius returns to Tarsus. When the foster-parents tell him that Tharsia has long been dead, he falls a prey to despair, retires to the forecastle of his ship and orders his crew to put out again. For the third time a tempest strikes him and this time he lands in Mytilene, where it is none other than Tharsia who is sent on board to try and comfort him in his despondency. To her repeated attempts to cheer him up with songs and riddles, he reacts by rebuffing and finally even striking her. Then Tharsia bursts into tears and tells him the sad story of her life.

(chs. 45–47) In Tharsia's tale Apollonius recognizes his daughter. He takes off his mourning; in royal garb he presides over the trial of the brothel-keeper and gives Tharsia in marriage to Athenagoras.

(chs. 48–51) Planning to stop in Tarsus on his way home, Apollonius is instructed in a dream to go to Ephesus and to relate his adventures in the temple there. As he tells his story in a loud voice in the temple of Artemis, the high priestess, Apollonius' wife believed to be dead, falls into his arms: the goddess has brought about the family's reunion. By way of Tarsus, where the wicked foster-parents are punished, the company travel to Cyrene, where the reunion with Archistrates takes place and the poor fisherman is rewarded. Thus in the end all turns out well, and together with his wife, who later bears him a son as well, Apollonius lives long and happily ever after.

Genre

This story, which Enk (1948) 231 rightly characterized as a fairy-tale, consists of a mixture of stock motifs of the ancient romance: far-flung voyages, tempests, shipwrecks, pirates, fishermen, love affairs, wicked foster-parents, dreams, virginity endangered yet preserved, separations, abductions, reunions⁴. Striking parallels are especially found in Greek romancers like Xenophon of Ephesus, Chariton, Achilles Tatius and, to a lesser extent, Heliodorus⁵, and it goes without saying that this immediately raises the question whether the HA is an original Latin tale or should rather be considered an adaptation or perhaps even a translation of a Greek original.

The story also has its weaknesses. Logic, never the ancient romance's strongest point, is conspicuously absent from the HA, particularly from the chapters dealing with Antiochus (chs. 1–3 and 24), whose main function seems to be that he causes the hero to start travelling (Apollonius' position as King of Tyre, ch. 4, and as pretender to the vacant throne of Antioch, ch. 24, remains unclear). But elsewhere in the story too one finds an illogical course of events, e.g. when a statue is erected to a fugitive wanting to hide (ch. 10). Moreover, certain parts of the narrative receive detailed treatment, such as the events at the court of Cyrene (chs. 11–23) and Tharsia's experiences (chs. 37–44), whereas other elements are kept extremely succinct: not a single word is devoted to Apollonius' fourteen-year-long sojourn in Egypt (ch. 28)⁶.

This raises the following question: has such extreme absence of logic and balanced composition always been characteristic of the HA, or is it the result of textual corruption or interpolation? Or could there be other factors at work here?

Distribution of the HA

The HA was extremely popular in the Middle Ages, so much so that Peters (1904), followed by Oroz (1954), subtitled his translation 'Der Lieblingsroman des Mittelalters,' and to a certain degree its success persisted even through the Renaissance. After a period of some neglect in the 17th–19th centuries, the HA is now regaining something of its previous popularity in our days.

Clear evidence of this popularity in the Middle Ages is in the first place offered by a relatively large number of Latin versions. The earliest of these is the *Gesta Apollonii* (10th century), a metrical version most probably created in a scholastic environment: it is bristling with scholarly words and expressions⁷. The next is the poetic version given by Godfrey of Viterbo in his *Pantheon*, dating from the years 1186–91, in which he regards Apollonius as a historical figure and sets him between the Seleucids and Hannibal⁸. From an entirely different environment springs the brief rhythmical poem in the collection known as the *Carmina Burana*⁹. The HA was also included in the *Gesta Romanorum*, a collection of stories chiefly taken from Roman history and gathered together in the 14th century, probably in England, with the practical aim of providing themes for sermons¹⁰. It is typical of the mentality of this collection, and of the criteria for inclusion, that the HA should here be given the subtitle *De tribulacione temporalis, que in gaudium sempiternum postremo commutabitur*, and equally typical that this version should end as follows: *Defunctus est [sc. Apollonius] et perrexit ad vitam eternam, ad quam [and there the text stops, with the usual ellipsis, which we may fill out to] nos perducatur, qui sine fine vivit et regnat deus per cuncta secula benedictus. Amen*. It is especially thanks to inclusion in this collection that the HA (either as part of the *Gesta* or as separately disseminated volume, and either in Latin or in any of the vernaculars) made its way throughout Europe¹¹. So far as regards medieval Latinity¹².

In Neo-Latin too, interest in the story of Apollonius incidentally remained alive. In this context I may mention Iacobus à Falckenburgk, as he calls

himself, an author born in Falcoburgum (Eastern part of Brandenburg, nowadays Zlocieniec), who, in his *Britannia, siue de Apollonica humilitatis, virtutis et honoris porta*, printed by Richard Grapheus, London 1578 (a work numbering 2352 hexameters in four books), gives an exceedingly free rendering of the ancient tale of Apollonius. He dedicated his work to Queen Elisabeth, to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and to William Cecil, Lord Burghley, in homage to England, the country that offered him, who had wandered as far and as wide as a latter-day Apollonius, a haven of refuge. It is surely at least partly due to the somewhat cryptic title that this version should have escaped scholarly notice¹³.

Next one can point out the exceedingly numerous translations and adaptations, both in prose and verse, in almost all European vernaculars, chronologically spearheaded by the Old English prose translation (beginning of the 11th century), of which only the first half and the last four chapters have been preserved¹⁴. It was followed by the Old French romance from the middle of the 12th century—of which only one fragment, comprising some 80 more or less intelligible, but partly heavily damaged verses, has been preserved in the form of four strips of vellum supporting the spine of an edition of Herodotus and Thucydides issued by the Aldine Press, Venice, 1502¹⁵—and then by the Spanish *Libro de Apolonio* (beginning/middle of the 13th century)¹⁶. The story's furthest journeyings in space and time are represented by the Modern Greek fairy-tale (19th century), told here and there in the coastal regions of Asia Minor (with which the HA has therefore returned to its presumed country of origin, viz. Asia Minor or Syria) on the one hand, side by side with a Greek ballad, until recently sung in the Cyclades, from which the entire story of the wicked King Antiochus has been left out¹⁷, and on the other hand by a group of seven Icelandic manuscripts (17th–20th century), preserved in Reykjavik and awaiting further examination¹⁸. The number of versions in between these extremes is virtually incalculable, due not only to geographical extension, but also to the fact that in various vernaculars several translations and adaptations appear in relatively rapid succession¹⁹. In France, for instance, we find 3 prose translations and 5 adaptations from the 14th and 15th century, in Germany 2 prose translations and 1 prose adaptation from the 15th century, in England, besides the Old English prose translation mentioned above, a total of 4 adaptations in verse and 4 in prose. Moreover, these translations and adaptations soon turn into chapbooks reprinted in rapid succession. The German chapbook version by H. Steinhoewel (a physician from Ulm who lived from 1412 to 1482), for instance, first printed in Augsburg in 1471, numbers at least five impressions in the period 1475–1500, almost all printed in the same town²⁰. Especially due to the *Gesta Romanorum* with its innumerable translations, the HA was also disseminated in countries like Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Russia. Sometimes its course of transmission was exceedingly tortuous, and at the same time highly illuminating. Thus an adaptation of one of the two principal versions (the adaptation called *Redaktion Stuttgart* by Klebs) formed the basis of the free revision given us by the Florentine poet Antonio Pucci (1310–80) under the title of *Istoria d'Apollonio di Tiro in ottava rima*²¹; in its turn, this adaptation

served as the model for the Middle Greek version from the end of the 15th century ascribed to Gabriel Akontianos²².

We also meet famous names in this connection, such as John Gower (*Confessio Amantis*, around 1390), and probably also Shakespeare (*Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, 1609). In our days, T.S. Eliot's *Marina* (1930) comes to mind as a poem clearly and even explicitly linked up with the Apollonius story²³.

Another indication of the distribution of the HA is formed by a number of references to and quotations from it, besides the relatively numerous allusions to the Apollonius figure both in Latin and in the vernaculars. To the best of my knowledge we find the earliest Latin reference in Venantius Fortunatus (6th century), discussed in further detail on pp. 97–98 below. References in crusaders' writings are worth mentioning: Apollonius was apparently regarded as a historical figure, whose palace was still to be seen, or so people thought, in Tyre²⁴.

As regards literature in the vernacular: the number of allusions to Apollonius in Provençal troubadours of the 12th and 13th centuries is very great, particularly in the *Flamenca*; references may furthermore be found in *King Alisaunder*, in Lamprecht's *Alexanderlied*, in *Orendel* and the so-called 'Kudrun saga', side by side with more or less direct borrowing of motifs in *Jourdain de Blaive*, *Tristan*, *Floire et Blancheflor*, and *Manekine*, to mention only a few major works²⁵.

What probably constitutes the strongest proof of the popularity of the HA is the number of Latin manuscripts, which is exceedingly large for a non-religious text. Alexander Riese, who in 1871 was the first to publish a scholarly edition of the HA, counted 22 at the time of his going to press; at the time of his second edition, in 1893, he had already reached 30. In 1899, in a celebrated study entitled 'Die Erzählung von Apollonius aus Tyrus', Elimar Klebs achieved a systematic arrangement of the manuscripts and then counted 64; he thought there could not be many more, and therefore felt it incumbent upon him to correct M. Haupt, who, in a letter to Tycho Mommsen, had remarked that there existed as many as 100 manuscripts of the HA (Klebs [1899] 17). In my own investigations I have reached a total considerably higher than the number that Klebs took exception to. Even while concluding the present study I encountered new manuscripts (see below, p. 22). The present corpus numbers 106 manuscripts containing the text of the HA and 2 comprising an abbreviated text, the so-called *compendium Libri Apollonii*. For more than one reason, it seems probable that the number now reached will go on increasing. In the first place, information offered in catalogues is often not detailed enough. Moreover, book collections of quite a number of libraries have not yet been made available in classified form. A special impediment to tracing the HA is the fact that it occurs under a variety of titles in the codices and hence in older library catalogues as well, or – and that not infrequently – that it bears no title whatsoever, giving rise to the risk that the work remains unlisted²⁶. Finally, we may expect that the examination of so-called *membra disiecta* (bindings, fly-leaves etc.) – a form of investigation whose importance is increasingly realized – will yield a number of fragments of manuscripts that have been cut up. It is precisely in the case of the HA that several such fragments have already become known²⁷.

In order to reach an objective estimate, however, one should not only take into account factors implying the possibility of a further increase in the number of extant manuscripts, but also the fact that many manuscripts must have been lost through a variety of causes (neglect, fire, theft) in the course of the centuries, even as recently as during World War II. My own investigations put me on the track of a not inconsiderable number of such cases (see Appendix II)²⁸. In any case, working one's way through medieval library catalogues does not only serve to determine the number of manuscripts of the HA that must have circulated in those days. On the contrary: they often supply a profusion of data greatly adding to the picture outlined by the manuscripts preserved, as regards popularity and distribution of the HA, the titles it went under, the category of writings it was classed with, and sometimes with regard to the value judgment passed on it. Furthermore, the listing of manuscripts in old library catalogues may be of particular service, even when such manuscripts are themselves now lost, in supplying us with an outline of the reception of the HA. Of course the oldest entries mentioning such lost manuscripts (Saint-Wandrille 747 and Reichenau 821–22) are of great importance in reconstructing the earlier stages in the distribution of the HA (see below, pp. 28 and 132–33).

So far the more or less directly ascertainable influence of the Apollonius story on medieval literature, as one generally finds it described in the handbooks²⁹. But there is an entirely different aspect to the popularity of the Apollonius theme, an aspect that the literature generally pays little attention to, but which will play an important role in the discussion that is to follow here. The fact is, that I hold that even the very manner in which the text of the HA was copied in the Middle Ages ties in with the regard in which it was held, and may be adduced as proof of its popularity. Examination of the manuscripts shows that the model text is only very rarely carefully copied: almost all scribes take the liberty of altering the text—either according to their own discretion and ability, or with the aid of other manuscripts—where wording, style or contents seem incorrect or illogical to them. In general this concerns minor changes only, but cases of sweeping revision are not wanting. Sometimes reasons are given for such proceedings, as in the case of a corrector jotting down in the margin: *Historia pulchra et elegans, si saltem correcta existat*³⁰, but a justification is almost invariably lacking. I am of the opinion that it is not only due to the absence of logic pointed out above (see p. 5), nor to the level of wording and style to be discussed hereafter (see pp. 64–65 and p. 98 ff.), but also to the work's popularity that the HA must be termed a 'texte vivant'³¹. The copyists, at least those who did not copy the text in a merely mechanical way, felt personally involved in the gripping story³², and in that way too many a scribe, sometimes followed by a corrector in his turn, turned into a 'reviser on a modest scale'. That this has greatly complicated the way in which the HA has come down to us, with all the consequences to an editor ensuing, needs no further argument.

All these facts taken together almost automatically give rise to the question of how such a basically simple story, and one that was not without its improbabilities either, could have gained such popularity. Of course a number of factors were involved, some of which lie outside our field of observation. One

of the most important factors was no doubt the tale itself, with its romantic events and complications, a tale moreover taking place in far-away countries only recently discovered by the Crusaders. The person of Apollonius too, as mentioned above, was highly attractive to certain strata in society, particularly the knights and their courts. Various statements make it clear that he was considered a real historical figure (see p. 7 with n. 24). Yet I believe that an entirely different factor should also be taken into account. However curious it may sound, there is quite an amount of evidence to the effect that by some Apollonius was not only considered a historical figure, but also a person worthy of imitation by Christians, a kind of Christian Job, who remained patient in the face of great calamity and was therefore predestined to end his life happily here on earth already: an echo of this interpretation was already audible in the subtitle of the HA in the *Gesta Romanorum*, as well as in the fact itself that the HA was felt to merit inclusion in this volume of sermon themes (see p. 5 above with n. 10). This interpretation within the domain of religion is also evident from a number of statements in Latin codices, but further elaboration of the matter would lead me beyond the scope of the present work³³. In view of the interpretation here pointed out, however, it should no longer surprise the reader that we find the HA in codices where it is surrounded by tales about historical figures like Alexander the Great and Charlemagne and by world chronicles on the one hand, and on the other hand by purely philosophical and theological treatises as well as moralizing discourses, as closer examination of the codices containing the HA will show (see ch. III).

2 *The problems around the HA, the desirability of a new edition of the two principal Latin recensions, and a short explanatory note to the prolegomena.*

The problems around the HA

From the very moment from which we date the oldest manuscripts of the HA that have come down to us (second half/end of the 9th century), we find diverging versions of the Latin text side by side, versions that, according to a time-hallowed usage, I shall call 'recensions', although certain objections may be brought against this use of the term³⁴. There are two principal versions, Recension A (RA) and Recension B (RB), each handed down in a relatively small number of manuscripts. The other codices, constituting by far the major part of the manuscript corpus, contain a number of recensions derived from RA and RB and jumbling the RA- and RB-tradition together to a varying degree ('Mischtexte', i.e. 'mixed texts'). Hence a primary task of HA research is the arranging of the manuscripts according to groups of texts represented, in order to dig out the history of the text as documented by manuscripts. Until the present day, Klebs has performed the most important work in this respect, but a definitive classification does not appear to have been realized yet. The relationship between manuscripts within a single recension also requires further study (see chapter II). All this means that a complete survey of the history of the HA since the 9th century is lacking.

A second question raised at once is that of the development the HA underwent before it comes to our knowledge in manuscripts. In the preceding section we have already seen that even on first acquaintance the HA raises problems connected with this question; I may call to mind the relation to the Greek romance as well as the want of logic in the story and its ill-balanced composition (pp. 4–5).

Anticipating a discussion of the *status quaestionum*, the following preliminary information may be useful. As regards the story, RA and RB generally run parallel to each other. Occasionally they may contain narrative elements of minor importance peculiar to either one (there are striking differences in the dosage of pagan elements such as astrology and worship of the *Manes*, as well as in the description of the voyage home of the happily reunited family, ch. 50, and in the conclusion), and they differ in their manner of presentation. RA shows a tendency to verbosity, yet one will search it in vain for numerous details that a critical mind looking for logic might ask for. RB strives for clear, concise description, and in numerous minor points the course of the story seems more logical: in ch. 1 the entire situation is clarified by the words *ex amissa coniuge*, in ch. 6 Apollonius is depicted more clearly as a king when he has the cylinders containing the scrolls handed to him, and contrary to RA, RB has names for the minor characters as well (in chs. 33 and 35 the brothel-keeper's slave is called Amiantus, and the physician in chs. 26–27 Chaeremon, names that do not occur in RA).

Language and style of both RA and RB are generally simple, although the simplicity is deceptive in some cases, since careful interpretation proves to demand a thorough knowledge of Vulgar and Late Latin (orthography, meanings of lexical items, constructions etc.), and is therefore not always easy. In any case, RA contains more vulgarisms than RB, while the latter is more succinct and at the same time more in accordance with classical grammar in its formulations. As regards wording, two further facts are of importance. The first is that, although the story takes place in an entirely pagan atmosphere, yet, both in RA and RB, and apparently in passages where such is definitely inopportune, or where, to say the least, no reason can be found for it, one encounters elements of Christian linguistic usage: Bible quotations, words or phrases appearing to be of biblical origin or in hallowed use, and set expressions such as *deo fauente*, *deo uolente* (in both recensions in the same passage as well, e.g. 28, RA/RB 1–2 *Apollonius ... gubernante deo applicuit Tharsos*). Many scholars think that such Christianisms may almost invariably be lifted from the text without the slightest damage to the context. Should one remove them, “as plaster from an antique fresco” (Enk [1948] 235), one would, they maintain, have a more or less pagan text left. The second fact is that in the Latin of both RA and RB, to however small an extent, Greek influence appears perceptible, e.g. in linguistic usage deviating from the Latin tradition (*dos* in 1, RA/RB 6; *nodus uirginitatis* 1, RA/RB 17), or in a construction like *Pater eius Apollonius, ex quo hinc profectus est, habet annos XIII* (31, RA 9–10).

In studying the oldest stages in the history of the HA, the aim should be to develop a view of RA and RB, their interrelation and their past history, that will offer a consistent explanation of the differences between the principal

recensions (e.g. the narrative elements peculiar to either one of them, the level of language and that of style), as well as of their similarities (such as the want of logic and coherence, the narration that varies between prolixity and succinctness, the Christianisms etc.). Such a view should also conclusively decide the matter of the HA's Greek background—another goal that has not been reached yet.

Riese (whose edition of 1893 is referred to unless otherwise specified) held the then generally prevalent opinion that the Latin HA goes back to a Greek original. According to him, RB arose from RA as an early variant version, but he did not go into the question of where the possibly original elements peculiar to RB may have come from. The Christianisms he suspected of being superficial interpolations; in the first edition he separated them from pagan elements ([1871] X–XI), and in the index to the second edition certain expressions are distinguished by means of a cross. In 1899, Klebs expressed views differing from Riese's on important points. In his opinion, RA and RB originated entirely independently from each other in an earlier phase *R*, whose contents and nature can be reconstructed from what RA and RB have in common; typical of *R*, according to Klebs, are a superficial Christianization and a linguistic usage indicative of the 5th century, while the alternation between verbose and succinct narration (the so-called epitome character) and the loose linkage of the Antiochus theme with the basic story turning around Apollonius are also said to go back to *R*. Before *R*, in Klebs's conception, lies a pagan Latin tale from the 3rd century A.D., siglum *Hi* ([1899] 217)³⁵. There is no question of a Greek original, and all elements even remotely tinged with Christian linguistic usage should be eliminated if one should want to reconstruct the original Latin HA (see Appendix III).

Klebs's view has found many adherents³⁶. Only rarely do we find any reservations expressed³⁷, so that one might say that the prevalent opinion on the HA's earliest history is determined by Klebs, except for the point of the background. It is true that there is no *communis opinio* on this score yet, but, contrary to Klebs, most scholars still tend to assume a Greek original underlying the Latin HA³⁸. Agreeing on all other points with Klebs's reconstruction, the majority see the Greek original as underlying *Hi*, which is then considered either a translation or a revision of a Greek text³⁹. The possibility of linking up such a Greek original with *R* is scarcely ever mentioned⁴⁰. On the other hand, the existence of a Greek original, presumed since the beginning of the 16th century (see p. 108 below), has never yet been rigorously proved, nor has any discovery among papyri or other materials, with even the slightest fragment of our original romance, turned up yet to help us out of our quandary⁴¹, while a reasonably clear conception of the nature and origin of the Greek original and of its position in the development of the Greek romance is lacking as well. Finally, it should be clear that acceptance of the existence of a Greek original gives rise to complicated questions concerning environment and manner in which such a hypothetical Greek text found its way into Latinity.

The desirability of a new edition of the oldest Latin recensions

Although the sole critical edition now available (Riese [1893], repr. 1973) is certainly not without its merits, there is an urgent need for a more modern one. Klebs's studies already demonstrated that the manuscript basis for an edition of RA and RB requires revision. Moreover, Riese's edition is typical of its period in knowledge of as well as attitude to non-classical linguistic phenomena: all sorts of deviations from classical Latinity occurring in the manuscripts, deviations that have in the meantime, thanks to the work of the Swedish (especially Einar Löfstedt)⁴² and the Nijmegen school (Christine Mohrmann) in particular, become familiar to modern scholarship as peculiarities of Vulgar, Late, Christian, or Early Medieval Latin, were not recognized as such by Riese, let alone retained in the text; with very few exceptions, they were not even recorded in the critical apparatus, so that much material illustrative of the development of Latin is hidden from view.

An edition of the principal recensions of the Latin HA in accordance with modern insights is the more desirable since scholarly interest in the ancient romance is increasing. The Greek romancers are paid ample attention to; as regards Latin literature Petronius remains the most favoured, it is true, but it should be pointed out that Apuleius also arouses interest, particularly in Groningen⁴³. Numerous editions and frequently thorough commentaries are seeing the light; original views and new information are being offered in monographs and articles. At an inspiring conference at Bangor (in 1976)⁴⁴ the impression was created that the moment is no longer far away when Erwin Rohde's masterpiece *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (1876; 1914³), now more than a century old, is going to be superseded by a new, comprehensive synthesis.

This growing scholarly interest also applies to the HA. After Klebs's major work little was published on the HA for some time, but little by little this situation was altered, both as regards the Latin HA—witness studies by such scholars as Goepf (1938), Perry (1967), Delbouille (1969), Lana (1975) and Hunt (1980, 1982)—and in the domain of the vernacular versions, for which domain I shall confine myself to mentioning only Deyermond (1968, 1973) and Alvar (1976). Whereas the field of the derived recensions already boasts an excellent edition by Raith (1956), there is still no critical edition of the principal recensions in which the results achieved by research since 1893 have been incorporated. I hope to supply this want to the best of my abilities, and thereby not only to serve those scholars specialized in studying the ancient romance, and the HA and its vicissitudes in particular—for RA and RB offer a text of eminent interest to philologists, Latinists as well as Romanists, because of its streak of Vulgar Latin and the tendency of scribes to correct that streak.

Finally, I am of the opinion that the story of the HA has something to offer the modern reader too, although it does not, in the form in which it has come down to us, rival the works of Petronius and Apuleius in Latin or Longus and Heliodorus in Greek.

Short explanatory note to the prolegomena

This introduction is followed by fairly extensive prolegomena to the text edition proper, in consequence of the fact that my investigations led me to conclude that I could not adopt Klebs's views on a number of highly important points, e.g. as regards the hypothesis that RB is independent of RA, the interrelation between the manuscripts within RA resp. RB, the possibility of eliminating Christianisms, the Latin originality championed by Klebs, and the presumed phases *R* and *Hi*. After the outline of the problems around the HA given above, it will be clear that such divergences of opinion have far-reaching consequences for an edition: it makes quite a difference whether one should attempt to reconstruct *R* or *Hi* on the basis of Klebs's hypothesis, or edit RA and RB, as I feel I should, on the basis of the strongest textual evidence to hand. In view of the high esteem in which Klebs is held—even though to the best of my knowledge his argumentation for *R* and *Hi* has never been critically tested—each of these divergences of opinion will have to be painstakingly justified.

The direction taken by my preliminary research has greatly enlarged the field of my investigation. In the following chapters of the prolegomena I shall only discuss those problems around the HA, however, that are of decisive importance to the constitution of the text in this edition. That is why a survey of the manuscripts known to me (ch. II) and a detailed description of the manuscripts of importance to this edition (ch. III) open the prolegomena. Follows a study of the relationship of the recensions to one another, and a study of the relationship of the manuscripts to each other within certain recensions (ch. IV). Next, attention will be mainly focussed on the two principal versions, and in a discussion of a philological nature both RA (ch. V) and RB (ch. VI) will be examined with special reference to Late Latin features, Christianisms, and possible traces of translation: the arguments offered by both RA and RB for a Greek original will only be unfolded in these chapters insofar as strictly necessary in order to give this new edition its editorial foundation. To round off my view of the genesis of the text, I shall—in striking contrast with Klebs's view—demonstrate the fact that the presumed phases *R* and *Hi* are entirely superfluous (ch. VII). I shall conclude with a discussion of the previous editions of the HA, together with an explanation of the editorial techniques employed in the present edition (ch. VIII).

The further problems concerning the Greek original touched upon above (p. 11) I hope to come back to in a commentary I should like to write as a sequel to the present publication, and towards which I have already collected much material in the many years of preparing this text edition. In such a commentary, I shall not only adduce further material to elucidate the history of the Latin text of the HA, and discuss striking readings and alterations in derived recensions and revisions, but also give parallels between the Greek romance and the Latin HA, and, finally, make an attempt to reconstruct the original Greek version of the HA (meanwhile see pp. 125 ff. below) and the road that the HA must have travelled to reach the form in which it has been handed down to us in the oldest Latin recensions.